



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/729,201	12/05/2003	Thomas Beck	2002P06120WOUS	2440

7590 05/17/2007
SIEMENS CORPORATION
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPT.
170 WOOD AVENUE SOUTH
ISELIN, NJ 08830

EXAMINER

SONG, MATTHEW J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1722

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/17/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/729,201	Applicant(s) BECK ET AL.	
	Examiner Matthew J. Song	Art Unit 1722	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 March 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 11-22 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 8 and 15-21 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7, 11, 14 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5, 6, 9, 12 and 13 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in Germany on 4/15/2002. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the DE 10216662.5 application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).
2. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in Germany on 9/19/2002. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the DE 10243558.8 application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).
3. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in Germany on 3/21/2003. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the PCT/DE03/00952 application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 22 recites the limitation "the optical system" in lines 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 1722

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 1-4, 11, 14 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurz et al (US 6,024,792) in view of Foster et al (US 6,333,484) and Kotera et al (US 4,177,372).

Kurz et al discloses a method of manufacturing monocrystalline structures on substrates. (Abstract.) The method is an epitaxial one (col2, ln 1-10) which utilizes an energy sources having a focal point at the surface to be melted. (col 2, ln 40-67). Laser beams, electron beams and arc methods are suitable. (col 2, ln 45-60) The melted material solidifies into the monocrystalline structure. (co 15, ln 1-67). A feed material is supplied to the area to be melted and is incorporated into the monocrystalline structure of the substrate and the material is completely melted. (col 5, ln 1-67 and claim 1). The arrow in Figure 4 shows movement in a

Art Unit: 1722

single direction, (col 5, ln 60-67) this clearly suggests applicant's direction transverse to the width only. The power and thus the temperature of the beam is selected to ensure dendritic growth and material are metallic superalloys (col 6, ln 10-20 and col 1, ln 5-55). Kurz et al also teaches the a round focal spot having a diameter of the laser spot is 2.5 mm (col 4, ln 60-67 and Fig 4), this clearly applicant's focal spot having a substantially elliptical geometry because the spot has a length and the spot is a laser spot, i.e. focus light. Kurz et al also teaches energy input with the energy beam is controlled in such a manner that the speed of the solidification and the temperature gradient lie in the dendritic crystalline region (col 6, ln 1-20). Kurz et al also teaches layering multiple epitaxial layers on top of each other (col 5, ln 20-35).

Kurz et al does not teach controlling a temperature of the focused length of the energy source by an optical system to determine when a next epitaxial is to be formed.

In a method of directional solidification of superalloys, note entire reference, Foster et al teaches the temperature of a weld area is controlled throughout the process in spite of added heat from the laser beam by using an optical pyrometer (col 3, ln 35-55). Foster et al also teaches a computer numerical control (CNC) controls the laser and the control means includes a vision system (col 4, ln 45-60).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kurz et al by using the optical pyrometer and CNC control system to measure temperature and control the laser, as taught by Foster et al, to accurately control the speed of solidification and the temperature gradient within a dendritic crystalline region, thus determines when the next epitaxial layer is formed ('792 col 5, ln 20-40 and col 6, ln 10-20).

The combination of Kurz et al and Foster et al does not teach the shape of the focal spot has a length less than the width.

In a method of zone melting, note entire reference, Kotera et al teaches a CO₂ laser beam having a rectangular or ellipsoidal shape (col 3, ln 1-15 and col 7, ln 1-25). Kotera et al also teaches elongating the laser beam in the direction substantially perpendicular to the moving direction 50 of the melting zone (col 9, ln 25-45 and Fig 2), this clearly suggests applicant's length in a direction of movement of the focal spot transverse to the width that is less than the width. Kotera et al also teaches by arranging the beam scanning as described, a uniform temperature distribution could be realized (col 7, ln 50-60).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Kurz et al and Foster et al by using an laser spot shape having a length less than the width, as taught by Kotera et al, to create a uniform temperature distribution.

Referring to claim 2-3, the combination of Kurz et al, Foster et al and Kotera et al teaches laser and electron beams ('792 col 2, ln 45-55).

Referring to claim 4, the combination of Kurz et al, Foster et al and Kotera et al teaches a substantially elliptical or rectangular spot.

Referring to claims 11 and 14, the combination of Kurz et al, Foster et al and Kotera et al teaches monocrystalline metallic super-alloy structures ('792 Abstract).

Referring to claim 22, the combination of Kurz et al, Foster et al and Kotera et al teaches temperature is controlled using a TV camera, this clearly suggests an optical system ('372 col 7, ln 60-68).

8. Claims 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurz et al (US 6,024,792) in view of Foster et al (US 6,333,484) and Kotera et al (US 4,177,372) as applied to claims 1-4, 11, 14 and 22 above, and further in view of Marcin et al (US 6,103,402).

The combination of Kurz et al, Foster et al and Kotera et al teaches all of the limitations of claim 7, as discussed previously, except feed of material is varied in terms of time and location.

Marcin et al teaches method of making crack free metallic articles using an energy beam, note entire reference. Marcin et al teaches incorporating a filler material into a super-alloy by the application of an energy beam. In example 1, Marcin et al teaches that a first spot power (and thus, spot temperature) and spot size were used followed by a second spot power and size. (col 7, ln 45 to col 8, ln 60). Marcin et al also teaches a powder feed was used to supply a powder to the melted areas of the substrate. Marcin et al also teaches powder flow rates may be between 0.5 g/min and about 50 g/min depending upon filler material, beam spot size and power density (col 7, ln 1-25). Thus Marcin et al teaches varying power and varying the feed of material depending on the beam density.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Kurz et al, Foster et al and Kotera et al varying the material as taught Marcin to produce a crack free material (col 8, ln 5-50).

Allowable Subject Matter

Art Unit: 1722

4. Claim 5, 6, 9, 12, and 13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

5. Claims 8 and 15-21 are allowed.

9. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: The closest prior art is Kurz et al (US 6,024,792) and Kotera et al (US 4,177,372). Kurz et al teaches a method of epitaxial growth comprising melting a surface with a laser and feeding material to a molten area which is solidified (Abstract). Kotera et al teaches a method of zone melting where the laser spot has a length in a direction of movement that is less than the width (Fig 2). However, Kurz et al nor Kotera et al teach or suggest controlling a power intensity at opposed ends of the width of the focal spot to be greater than the power intensity in a central area of the width of the focal spot.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4, 7, 11, 14 and 22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 1722

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Song whose telephone number is 571-272-1468. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yogendra Gupta can be reached on 571-272-1316. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1722

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MJS
May 10, 2007

Matthew J Song
Examiner
Art Unit 1722



ROBERT KUNEMUND
PRIMARY EXAMINER